U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service

PB-270 720

Effect of Driver Mass Tolerance on Motorcycle Emissions and Fuel Economy

Environmental Protection Agency, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Nov 76

EE 76-10
PB 270 720

Technical Support Report

Effect of Driver Hose Tolerance on Motorcycle Emissions and Fuel Economy

November 1976

Notice

Technical support reports for regulatory action do not necessarily represent the final EPA decision on regulatory issues. They are intended to present a technical analysis of an issue and recommendations resulting from the assumptions and constraints of that analysis. Agency policy constraints or data received subsequent to the date of release of this report may alter the conclusions reached. Readers are cautioned to seek the latest analysis from EPA before using the information contained herein.

Standards Development and Support Branch
Emission Control Technology Division
Office of Mobile Source Air Pollution Control
Office of Air and Waste Management
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No.	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle: Effect of Driver Mass Tolerance on Motorcycle Emission and Fuel Economy			5. Report Date: November 1976
7. Author(s): Standards Development and Support Branch			8. Performing Organization Rept. No. MC 76-10
9. Performing Organization Name and Address: Standards Development and Support Branch Emission Control Technology Division U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.
			11. Contract/Grant No.
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address: Same as Box 9			13. Type of Report & Period Covered: Technical Support Report
			14.

15. Supplementary Notes

16. Abstracts

The objective of this testing program was to determine the appropriateness with respect to emissions of the driver mass tolerance specified in §86.529(c)(1) of the motorcycle regulations. In developing these regulations, two factors were considered: 1) by specifying a restrictive tolerance, too many potential test drivers might be excluded; by specifying a broad tolerance, wide variations in emissions results were considered possible. Therefore, to accomodate both of these factors, the tolerance was specified as ± 10kg. To determine the appropriateness of this tolerance prior to final rulemaking, a test program was conducted to measure emissions and fuel economy at various driver masses. The test vehicle used was a Honda CB360 which represents a typical middle weight, four stroke motorcycle.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors

Air pollution
Motorcycles
Exhaust gases
Fuel consumption
Tolerances

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

Driver mass tolerance
Mass tolerance
Driver mass
Fuel economy

17c. COSATI Field/Group

18. Availability Statement: Release Unlimited	19. Security Class (This Report): UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages: 15
	20. Security Class (This Page): UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price

THIS FORM MAY BE REPRODUCED

EPA-AA-IMS-6/76

Abstract

Motorcycle emissions and fuel economy were measured as driver mass was varied. Compared to the specified driver mass (80 kg), significant differences in emissions and fuel economy were first observed when the mass was varied ± 10 kg from the specified mass.

Prepared by

Approved By: Project Manager, Motorcycle Regulations

Approved By:
Branch Chief,
Standards Development and Support Branch

Approved By:
Division Director,
Emission Control Technology Division

Introduction

In developing the motorcycle regulations, two factors were considered when the driver mass tolerance was specified for emission testing. First, by specifying a restrictive tolerance, too many potential test drivers might be excluded. But, by specifying a broad tolerance, wide variations in emissions results were considered possible. Therefore, to accommodate both of these factors, the tolerance was specified as ± 10 kg.

To determine the appropriateness of this tolerance prior to final rule making, a test program was conducted to measure emissions and fuel economy at various driver masses. The test vehicle used was a Honda CB360 which represents a typical middle weight, four stroke motorcycle.

Summary and Conclusions

Based on the results of these tests the tolerance of ± 10 kg is an appropriate driver mass tolerance for emission testing.

Trends[6] of increasing HC, CO, and CO_2 and decreasing fuel economy were observed as driver mass was increased from about 60 to 120 kg. Though these emissions, fuel economy, and bag 1 NO_x correlated well with driver mass, bag 2 NO_x emissions were very low in concentration and difficult to accurately measure, and did not correlate well, while composite NO_x just missed correlating.

Discussion

A. Test Objective

The objective of this testing program was to determine the appropriateness with respect to emissions of the driver mass tolerance specified in §86.529(c)(1) of the motorcycle regulations.

To accomplish this emissions' measurements were made on a Honda CB 360 while driven over the Urban Dynamometer Driving Schedule. The test procedure with exceptions noted below were in accordance with the Federal Test Procedure. Nominal driver masses of 60, 70, 80, 90, 100, and 110 kg were tested where 80 kg is the specified nominal driver mass setting. To eliminate variations due to different drivers, such as in expertise, capability, and degree of training, the same driver was used throughout the testing sequence. Additional mass was centered directly underneath the driver to attain the higher mass settings. To obtain repeatable results and minimize test time, only hot start bag 1 and 2 tests were conducted. This was repeated three times at each driver mass setting.

[6] A significance level of .05 was used in these determinations. This same significance level is implicit in all subsequent references to trend and differences throughout this report.

B. Effect of Driver Mass

Figure 1 shows the results of this study plotted against nominal driver mass. These plots are not sufficient to reveal with confidence the relationship between emissions and driver mass.

To determine the relationship between emissions (and fuel economy) and driver mass, a linear regression analysis was performed. Using the mean emissions and fuel economy results at each driver mass, the regression equation has the form:

$$\text{Emissions} = a_0 + a_1(\text{Driver Mass})$$

where a_0 is the y-intercept and a_1 is the slope of the regression line.

Table 1 presents the effects on emissions and fuel economy of varying driver mass. Only those data displaying sufficient correlation are presented. Table 2 presents actual correlation coefficients which should be considered when interpreting these results. HC, CO, and CO_2 increased while fuel economy decreased with increasing driver mass and displayed good correlation. NO did not quite show sufficient correlation on a composite basis. (Bag 1 results correlated well, however, bag 2 results did not. This may have been due to the difficulty in measuring the low bag 2 concentrations of NO_x.)

After determining the relationships between emissions and driver mass, it was necessary to determine the extent to which driver mass could be varied from the specified driver mass before significant differences in emissions would be observed. To do this, an analysis of variance of emission results was performed. This is described by the following:

$\frac{\bar{x}_{80} - \bar{x}_{101}}{s\left(\frac{1}{n_{80}} + \frac{1}{n_{101}}\right)}$ is distributed as a t-statistic where:

$\bar{x}_{80}$ is the mean emissions at a driver mass of 80 kg

$\bar{x}_{101}$ is the mean emissions at the driver mass to be compared

s is the pooled standard deviation and is equal to:

$$\sqrt{\frac{s_{80}^2(n_{80}-1) + s_{101}^2(n_{101}-1)}{n_{80} + n_{101} - 2}}$$

n_{80}, n_{101} are the number of test points at each driver mass, respectively

Using tables with the percentage points of the t-distribution, the level of significance of the comparison can be determined. Differences in emissions were considered significant at a significance level of about .05 or below.

Effects of Defense Cuts on
Unemployment
and Civil Economy
Comparative econometric
and input-output models
Econometric - Input-output

TABLE I

Correlation Between Predicted Values Using Intermediate Equation and Actual Test Emissions

Test Condition Number	SO, ppm				CO, ppm				CO_2, ppm				SO_2, g/hr	FUEL ECONOMY g/l/km			
	Light-Off Time, Secs.	% Diff. from 60 Sec	Ambient Test Temp.	% Diff. from 60 Sec	Light-Off Time, Secs.	% Diff. from 60 Sec	Ambient Test Temp.	% Diff. from 60 Sec	Light-Off Time, Secs.	% Diff. from 60 Sec	Ambient Test Temp.	% Diff. from 60 Sec		Light-Off Time, Secs.	% Diff. from 60 Sec	Ambient Test Temp.	% Diff. from 60 Sec
60	3.68	+6.5	3.62	+10.4	44.8	+4.3	43.3	+5.8	46.9	+2.4	45.0	+6.3	(1)	33.1	+1.8	35.6	+5.4
72	4.02	+1.2	3.95	+4.8	45.7	+2.0	43.9	+4.4	47.6	+1.1	46.3	+2.7		37.8	+1.8	37.6	+3.3
68	4.07	—	4.04	—	45.6	—	46.0	—	48.1	—	48.4	—		37.5	—	37.8	—
70	4.09	+5.0	4.05	+6.0	47.6	+2.1	48.3	+3.6	48.8	+1.3	48.7	+2.4		37.1	-2.7	36.9	+5.6
111	4.42	+1.6	4.37	+2.7	48.6	+4.3	47.4	+5.1	47.1	+2.5	45.4	+3.7		36.8	+7.3	36.9	+2.6
119	4.69	+10.1	4.61	+8.7	51.5	+5.6	48.9	+4.7	50.3	+5.0	50.1	+2.3		38.1	+7.6	38.4	+2.5

(1) Insufficient emissions at a 95% confidence level to allow prediction.

Reproduced from best available copy.

TABLE 8

Multiple Mass Regression Statistics

		BE	BB	BB_2	BB_5	Fuel Economy
Reg 1	R	.9763	.9358	.9886	.8181	-.8158
	t req'd for 95% conf. level	2.0555	2.0518	2.0555	2.0518	2.0555
	signif. @ 95%	yes	yes	no	yes	yes
Reg 2	R	.8099	.8797	.8372	.5842	-.8459
	t req'd for 95% conf. level	2.0555	2.0555	2.0555	2.0555	2.0555
	signif. @ 95%	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
Reg 3	R	.8195	.5101	.8715	.1638	-.8335
	t req'd for 95% conf. level	2.0555	2.0555	2.0555	2.0555	2.0555
	signif. @ 95%	yes	yes	yes	no	yes

Hypothesis Tests of the Slope of the Regression Lines

H_0: slope = 0

		B E	E B	B B_2	B B_5	Fuel Economy
Reg 1	slope	.8115	.1023	.8565	2.56×10^{-5}	-5.51×10^{-3}
	t-test signif. level	.0319	.0006	.0119	.8461	.0095
	reject H_0: slope = 0?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Reg 2	slope	.0136	.0113	.0155	1.14×10^{-2}	-2.37×10^{-3}
	t-test signif. level	.0110	.0705	.0110	.1358	.0101
	reject H_0: slope = 0?	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
Reg 3	slope	.0170	.1071	.0612	1.59×10^{-5}	-3.58×10^{-3}
	t-test signif. level	.0095	.0111	.0221	.8772	.0135
	reject H_0: slope = 0?	yes	yes	yes	no	yes

Table 3 presents significance levels for comparisons of all driver masses. In figure 2 the shaded areas show where significant differences are first observed as driver mass is allowed to vary from the specified mass of 80 kg. For HC these differences occur almost exactly at ± 10 kg. For CO, CO_2, and fuel economy differences are first observed as shown in Figure 2, however a review of the significance levels in Table 3



Figure 2

indicate that differences reach significance somewhat before the shaded areas indicate. No data were taken to show exactly where these differences become significant.

C. Physical Interpretation of the Effect of Driver Mass

For passenger car tires, it has been fairly well established[1,2] that as vertical load increases (decreases) the rolling resistance of bias ply tires also increases (decreases). Although this has not been shown to be true specifically for motorcycle tires, these tires are also of the bias ply type and it seems reasonable that they would behave in a

similar manner. Thus, the increased vertical load increases the power required to move the vehicle at a given speed. This requires greater throttle openings thereby increasing the mass flow of air-fuel mixture into the engine. Since the air-fuel ratio did not change significantly*, the greater throttle opening has the effect of increasing the mass of emissions and fuel consumption which was substantiated by the data in this study.

D. Applicability to Other Motorcycles

The results of this study should be applicable to other motorcycles on a general basis. To overcome added load, it is necessary for all motorcycles to increase throttle opening which will increase their mass emissions and fuel consumption. This effect may be more dramatic for smaller motorcycles and somewhat less noticable for larger ones, however, the aggregate effect would be expected to be similar to that shown by this study.

E. Recommendations

These tests revealed that emissions and fuel economy become significantly different as driver mass deviates by about 10 kg from the specified value of 80 kg. Because a restrictive tolerance would exclude many potential drivers, and a broad tolerance will significantly affect emissions and fuel economy results, it is recommended that the driver mass tolerance be ± 10 kg.

* These results are not shown because of their approximate nature.

References

1. Villet, P.R., "Hysteretic Losses in Rolling Tires," Rubber, Chemistry, and Technology, Vol. 46, No. 2, pg 425-441 (1973).

2. Rohuring, O.J., "Rolling Resistance of Tires Measured Under Transient and Equilibrium Conditions on Calspan's Tire Research Facility," Dept. of Transportation Report No. DOT-TSC-OST-76-9, pg 69-71 (March 1976)